Peeter W. J. VERLEGH

THE PSYCHOLOGY OF COUNTRY-OF-ORIGIN EFFECTS

The impact of product origin on consumer product evaluations is well-documented, and several types of influence have been described in the literature. In this paper, the author will first describe some of the practical and scientific support for this effect, and then focus on the psychology behind the country-of-origin effect. Drawing from recent studies, this paper will review cognitive, affective and normative country-of-origin effects, and discuss the mechanisms behind the. Special attention will be paid to the general preference for domestic products over foreign alternatives, and to the interaction between country of origin and other marketing variables, such as advertising

> *"Commodities are lowercase brands when no one speaks up to claim them, but identities quickly arise: Japanese rice, Norwegian salmon, amber from the Baltics, diamonds from Africa and cotton grown in Egypt are differentiated from other rice, salmon, amber, diamonds, and cotton"*
>
> Sidney Levy (1996, p.170)

This article examines the impact of country of origin of products on consumers' product evaluations. The relevance of this topic was recognized already in one of the earliest papers on international (global) consumer behavior (Dichter, 1962), in which it was argued that a product's country of origin may have a "tremendous influence on the acceptance and success of products" (p.116). This idea is taken one step further by the introducing quote by Levy (1996), who noted that country of origin provides products and brands with an identity or meaning. Verlegh and Steenkamp (1999) provide a quantitative and qualitative review of country-of-origin research, which further supports the importance of country-of-origin effects in consumer behavior. Unlike the academic relevance, the practical relevance of country of origin has not gone undisputed. Japanese management-guru Kenichi Ohmae, for example, asserted that consumers "don't care about country of origin … [and] don't worry about where the product was made" (Ohmae, 1989, p.144). Recently, this concern was echoed by Usunier (2006), who argued that the large academic interest in country-of-origin effects does not reflect the limited relevance of this concept for consumers and companies. Usunier argues that country-of-origin research thus provides an excellent illustration of the "relevance gap" that characterizes much of today's research on management. But let's take a closer look at the issue of managerial relevance of country-of-origin effects.

The managerial relevance of country-of-origin effects depends first and foremost on consumers' awareness of the country of origin of products. Country of origin is generally indicated by "Made in …" labels. The use of these labels has been traced back to the ancient Greece, where it was common practice to stamp products with logos or other indications of origin (Aaker, 1996). For most products, country-of-origin labels are legally required in the US, the European Union, and many other countries, but practices like international sourcing make it increasingly difficult to answer the question "where does this product come from?" One way to address this issue is the introduction of a more fine-grained classification of product origins, distinguishing for example between "country of design", "country of production", and "country of assembly." This idea has been adopted for example by Ikea, which labels its products as "Made in … – Design and Quality: Ikea of Sweden".

"Made in" labels are found on most products. But these labels are not the only cues that consumers may use to infer the country or origin (or "nationality") of products. As illustrated by the examples in table 1, marketing instruments like advertising and branding may be used to implicitly or explicitly link a product to a (origin) country. Such links do not necessarily represent the "truth", i.e, they may link a product to a country other than the place of manufacture or design. For example, despite of sounding American or British, "Kenwood" is a Japanese make of consumer electronics, and the British flag on Reebok shoes has got no connection to the brand's country of origin (US) or to the shoes' country of manufacture (mostly Asian countries). Leclerc, Schmitt and Dubé (1994) have coined the term "foreign branding" to refer to such practices.

Table 1.

Examples of references to country of origin

Marketing Instrument	Type of Reference
Advertising	Explicit: ▪ Absolut: "Vodka from the country of Sweden" ▪ Siemens: "from Germany with love" Implicit (through the use of language or visuals): ▪ BMW: "Freude am Fahren" (in US and pan-European ads) ▪ Audi: "Vorsprung durch Technik" (in UK ads) ▪ Milka chocolate: use of alpine scenery in TV-ads
	▪ Ricola candy: Swiss costume and alpine landscapes in TV-ads
Branding / Labeling	Explicit ▪ Café de Colombia ▪ American Express ▪ Swissair/British Airways/Air France /Singapore Airlines ▪ Clearly Canadian
	Implicit (linguistic references or the use of colors/flags/symbols) ▪ Kenwood vs. Mitshubishi (both Japanese) ▪ Boursin: French-sounding (Unilever brand) ▪ Buitoni, Raguletto: Italian-sounding (Nestlé, Unilever brands) ▪ Ikea: blue and yellow as corporate colors (combined with the explicit "of Sweden") ▪ Reebok: use of the British flag in the brand's logo

Moreover, although consumers may not know where a specific product is manufactured, they often link a specific nationality to brands and companies: Nike is American, Gucci and Ferrari are Italian, Sony and Mitsubishi are Japanese, and Volkswagen is German. Like other "brand demographics" such as age, and social class, country of origin is an antecedent of brand personality (Aaker, 1997), or in the words of Papadopoulos and Heslop (1993, p xxii) "[Country of origin] is to a product what *occupation* is to a new acquaintance we make at a party: we sort of have to ask about it (if it has not already been offered) to put our new friend into context [and] to make a value judgment".

To examine the idea that consumers associate (well-known) brands with a particular country of origin, I surveyed 77 students taking an introductory course in consumer behavior at Erasmus University in Rotterdam. The respondents were asked to fill out a one-page questionnaire which contained a list of brand names. For each of these brands, respondents were asked to write down the country with which they thought the brand was associated most strongly. The brands were taken from a ranking of 75 "billion dollar brands", which are considered to be the most valuable brand names worldwide. This ranking is based on research carried out by the Interbrand group and Citibank (Financial Times). From this list, I selected the fifteen highest ranked brand names, applying the restriction that a maximum of two brands could originate from the same country (as listed in the ranking). This resulted in the list in table 2, which shows a large degree of consensus in the countries that respondents associated with each of the brands. For each of the brands, the country that was mentioned most often was equal to actual country of origin (as listed in the Financial Times ranking). Brands were associated with 1 to 13 different countries (mean = 4.2 , median = 3). The lowest degree of consensus was found for Nescafé, which was associated with 13 different countries. But even for this brand, the top three countries accounted for 73% of the responses. For the other brands, the top three countries accounted for more than 90% of responses. For ten brands, we found that a single country accounted for more than 90% of responses, and we obtained 100% consensus for four of these brands (Microsoft, Mercedes, Heineken, and Philips).

These results support the idea that consumers are able to (correctly) identify the country of origin of large brands, regardless of whether or not the brand is actively promoting this association. This finding, in turn, emphasizes the practical relevance of country of origin. In an era where products are sourced and produced internationally, consumers continue to associate brand with certain countries, and depending on their strength and valence, these associations may be an important positive or negative element of a brand's

Table 2.

Countries associated with well-known brands (N=77)

Brand (Origin Country)	Three most mentioned countries (number of respondents reporting specific association)			% associated with "correct" country (total # of countries)
Coca-Cola (US)	US (76)	Australia (1)		99 (2)
Microsoft (US)	US (77)			100 (1)
Nescafé (SWI)	Switzerland (27)	Netherlands (20)	Italy (9)	35 (13)
Mercedes (GER)	Germany (77)			100 (1)
Ericsson (SWE)	Sweden (61)	Finland (6)	Denmark (4)	79 (7)
Chanel (FRA)	France (75)	Italy (1)	USA (1)	97 (3)
Sony (JAP)	Japan (71)	Netherlands (3)	France(1)	92 (5)
Heineken (NL)	Netherlands (77)			100 (1)
Samsung (KOR)	Korea (33)	Japan (30)	Germany (8)	43 (6)
Ikea (SWE)	Sweden (71)	Netherlands (5)	Norway (1)	92 (3)
Philips (NL)	Netherlands (77)			100 (1)
Gucci (ITA)	Italy (71)	France (4)	Japan (1)	92 (4)
Toyota (JAP)	Japan (72)	Korea (2)	Australia (1)	94 (5)
Nokia (FIN)	Finland (42)	Japan (18)	Sweden (11)	92 (8)
BMW (GER)	Germany (75)	US (1)	Switzerland (1)	100 (3)

image. In a recent study in Slovenia, for example, van Rekom a et al. (forthcoming) found that some consumers associate the Western (American) origin of McDonalds with the company being "pushy" in their selling and marketing.

How does country-of-origin influence consumers?

The impact of country of origin on information processing

Several studies have examined how country of origin influences consumers' judgments and choices. A large body of research shows that consumers use country of origin as a form of information about the quality and other attributes of a product. This results in different evaluations of identical products with different country-of-origin labels, even when additional product information is presented (Verlegh – Steenkamp, 1999). Consumers use country of origin as a cognitive shortcut when evaluating products, especially when other information is scarce. In line with this, country of origin has a greater impact on product evaluations when consumers are less motivated to process available information, for example when involvement is low (Han, 1989; Maheswaran, 1994).

Verlegh, Steenkamp and Meulenberg (2005) extend this conceptualization, and show that country of origin does not only act as an informational cue, but also affects consumers' interpretation of advertising claims. They argue that country of origin may also acts as a "source" cue, which helps consumers to interpret other information about the product (for example, information that is presented in the form of advertising). Although marketing research on source credibility has been mostly focused on celebrities and other spokespersons, Rossiter – Percy (1997, p.260) argue that the definition of source variables should not be taken too narrowly, and that entities such as companies and brands should be regarded as sources of advertising claims. This view is in line with studies investigating the role of corporate credibility in consumer evaluations of advertising and other marketing tools (Goldberg – Hartwick, 1990; Brown – Dacin, 1997). In these studies corporate credibility is defined as "the extent to which consumers believe that a company can deliver products and services that satisfy customer needs and wants" (Keller – Aaker 1992, p. 37; see also Brown – Dacin, 1997). Analogously, country-of-origin credibility is determined by consumers' product-country image. In a given product category, country-of-origin credibility is high when consumers have a favorable image of the country's products in that category, and low when the product-country image is unfavorable (Verlegh et al., 2005).

In an experiment conducted among more than 700 German consumers, Verlegh et al., (2005) tested this notion, by comparing these consumers' responses to different ads for Dutch and Spanish tomatoes. At the time of the study, German consumers' image of Dutch tomatoes was poor, and Dutch tomatoes were known as "Wasserbomben" (waterbombs). Spanish tomatoes were the most important competitors, and seen as natural and sun-ripened produce. The experiment supported the notion that country of origin plays a dual role in this setting, acting as an informational variable, but also as a source variable. The first role was supported by the finding of a main effect of country of origin, which was moderated by ad involvement. Overall, Spanish tomatoes were judged more favorably than Dutch tomatoes, and this difference was larger for lower levels of ad involvement. This supports the notion that consumers use country of origin as an informational variable, and as a cognitive shortcut, a strategy that is relied upon when consumers seek to minimize cognitive efforts (Han, 1989; Maheswaran, 1994). The second (source variable) role was supported by a significant three-way interaction between country of origin, ad involvement, and ad type. For Dutch tomatoes (with an unfavorable country-of-origin), we found that an increase in the favorability of advertising claims had a negative effect when ad involvement was high, but not when involvement was low. This interaction was not obtained for Spanish tomatoes, and there even was some evidence for a boomerang effect of modest claims, in which a more intense processing of moderate claims lead to a decrease in product evaluations. Together with other experiments (for example, Li – Wyer 1994; Haubl – Elrod 1999), these results show that country-of-origin effects may be more complex than is often suggested, and emphasize the relevance of studying this phenomenon.

The psychology of domestic versus foreign: identification and ethnocentrism

An important and oft researched aspect of country-of-origin effects is the distinction between foreign and domestic goods. Research on this distinction has often found that consumers' product judgments often display a positive bias that favors domestic products over foreign alternatives. (Papadopoulos – Heslop – Bamossy, 1990; Verlegh – Steenkamp, 1999). The home country bias in product judgments is often conceptualized as a form of "protectionism" at the consumer level. For example, Engel, Blackwell and Miniard note (1995: p.210): "In this age of intensifying international competition and the loss of many manufacturing jobs to cheaper foreign labor, it is not surprising that the country in which a product is produced has become an important consideration among many American consumers. Some companies have tried to capitalize on this concern by emphasizing that their product is Made in the U.S.A.." To explain this bias, Shimp and Sharma (1987) introduced the concept of consumer ethnocentrism. This concept represents a belief that it is inappropriate to buy foreign products, and that consumers should support domestic companies through the purchase of domestic products. Consumer ethnocentrism reflects a desire to protect the domestic economy. Ethnocentric consumers view purchasing imported products as wrong, because they think it hurts the domestic economy. To measure individual-level differences in consumer ethnocentrism, Shimp and Sharma (1987) developed the CETSCALE, which contains items like "[American] people should not buy foreign products, because this hurts US business and causes unemployment." In line with the economic stance of the construct, consumer ethnocentrism is stronger in regions and industries where employment is threatened by foreign competition (Shimp – Sharma 1987). In several studies, Shimp and Sharma (1987) demonstrate a strong positive relationship between consumer ethnocentrism and the quality evaluations and buying intentions for domestic products. Judgments of foreign products are negatively related to the construct. Herche (1992) obtained similar findings for Canadian consumers. Netemeyer, Durvasula and Lichtenstein (1991) replicated these results in Japan, France and the US, but not in Germany. Nonetheless, this literature firmly establishes that economic concerns may motivate consumers to prefer domestic goods over foreign goods.

Recently, Verlegh (forthcoming) showed that economic concerns are not the only motivator of consumer preferences for domestic versus foreign products, and that multiple motives for this bias should be taken into consideration. Consumers' attachment to their country goes well beyond economic concerns, as nationality is part of consumers' identity. Giddens (1981) noted that a country's inhabitants have "an overall awareness ... of belonging to an inclusive community with a certain identity." Billig (1995) and others argue that countries should in many ways be considered as social groups linked with a national identity. This identity is reinforced in daily life by language, cultural products, and symbols like flags, which strengthen the feeling of belonging (Billig, 1995). Individuals seek to express this identity through consumption, and domestic products often have important social and cultural connotations, and may serve as a symbol for national identity (Askegaard – Ger, 1998). Verlegh (forthcoming) shows that preferences for domestic products are related to the social and emotional significance that consumers attach to their home country. This perspective builds on the large body of research on the evaluation of ingroups and outgroups (Mackie – Smith, 1998), which has established the existence of a positive bias in ratings of the performance and achievements of the own group (ingroup) relative to other groups (outgroups). This ingroup bias is attributed to a common need for maintaining a positive evaluation of the self and the social groups one belongs to. The strength of ingroup bias increases with the level of identification (Tajfel, 1978; Turner, 1999). Verlegh (forthcoming) shows that national identification (i.e., consumers' identification with the own country as an ingroup) can be differentiated from consumer ethnocentrism, and that these constructs complement each other in the explanation of consumers' evaluations and purchase intentions toward domestic and foreign products. The strength of national identification may vary between individuals, but also between situations. For example, many consumers experience a boost in national identification when they view a match of a national sports team, especially when the team is involved in large tournaments like world championships or Olympics. Around the world, the 2006 World Cup soccer in Germany has led many brands to adapt their advertising and promotion strategies in order to connect to their customers' increased national identification, by means of giveaways or ads featuring the national colors.

National identification and consumer ethnocentrism both relate to preferences for domestic vs. foreign products, but these relationships are based on different mechanisms. As discussed above, consumer ethnocentrism primarily captures economic aspects of home country bias, and is based on the desire to protect the own economy. Conversely, national identification is rooted in consumers' need to enhance group- and self-esteem, and based on a desire for a positive social identity. These mechanisms offer complementary means to explain and predict consumers' willingness to purchase domestic (versus foreign) products. This does not mean that these two constructs are unrelated. Verlegh (forthcoming) shows that consumers who have a stronger national identification are likely to have a stronger desire to protect the own country's economy. When identification is higher, consumers attach more importance to the home country, and feel a stronger desire to economically support it. An interesting finding in Verlegh (forthcoming) is that national identification is more strongly related to evaluations of domestic products than to the evaluations of foreign products. This is in line with social identity theory, which views ingroup bias as an instrument to enhance one's esteem of the own group. A positive bias in ratings of the ingroup is more effective to this end than a negative bias in ratings of outgroups. This is different for consumer ethnocentrism, which emphasizes the need to protect the own economy by choosing domestic goods over foreign alternatives. In line with this, consumer ethnocentrism leads not only to a positive bias in ratings of domestic products, but also to a negative bias in ratings of foreign products. This difference in results for national identification and consumer ethnocentrism stresses the importance of recognizing the contribution of each of these construct to home country bias.

Although ingroup bias mostly manifests itself in the form of a positive bias toward the own group and its products, there are several factors that may foster the occurrence of a negative bias toward outgroup products (Brewer, 1979, Hewstone et al., 2002). Both Brewer (1979) and Hewstone et al., (2002) emphasize that strong emotions or group threat are necessary to evoke negative responses toward an outgroup. The animosity model (Klein, 2002; Klein – Ettenson – Morris, 1998) relates to such strong emotions. This model has been validated in several countries, and explains how negative evaluations of foreign goods may be fueled by feelings of animosity produced by (a history of) political, military or economic conflict between countries.

Research in developing economies shows that the notion of a favorable home country bias may not be as universal as one might think. Among others, Okechukwu and Onyemah (1999) find that consumers in developing economies may display a negative bias toward domestic products. Such findings may be caused by additional psychological variables that affect product evaluations and are in some cases strong enough to overcome the positive bias that results from the need for self-enhancement. Ger, Askegaard and Christensen (1999) find an admiration of Western products for Turkish consumers, and Batra et al. (2000) find these effects for consumers from India. In general, the purchase and ownership of foreign goods may be a behavioral strategy that allows consumers to dissociate themselves from the own culture and associate with a favorable social identity. Within SIT, such a strategy has been referred to as "social mobility" (Ellemers et al., 1993). Additional research is needed to explore such strategies in the realm of consumer behavior.

How can country of origin be used by marketers?

Marketers often seek to leverage the effects of country of origin on consumer product evaluations, and attempt to build brand equity by associating their brand to a country of origin with favorable connotations (Leclerc – Schmitt – Dubé, 1994; Keller, 2003). In general, country-of-origin effects are due to the fact that consumers hold general images of a country's products. These images are specific to product categories, and may range from simple evaluative impressions to rich networks of cognitive and affective associations. In this section I will focus mainly on the evaluative dimension of these images, and distinguish between cases in which consumers have favorable versus unfavorable images of a country's products within a category. Strategic implications are given for both situations.

If consumers have a favorable image of a country's products within a category, products from that country might benefit from a strong association with the origin country. This could be established by emphasizing the country of origin in advertising, packaging or branding (see table 1 for examples). Strategies like this may be enhanced when marketing communications are focused on relevant (and preferably well-known) characteristics of the origin country. This practice establishes a link between consumers' perceptions of the brand or product, and their perceptions of the country of origin. For example, marketers could emphasize a relevant country characteristic in their advertising, such as displaying mountains and waterfalls in an ad for "Clearly Canadian" mineral water. Another example is the recent slogan for French fruit that was used by the French promotional board Sopexa: "The sun in France just tastes better". Different product categories will benefit from links to different elements of consumers' perceptions of the origin country. Marketers should carefully examine for their own brands whether their country of origin has a favorable or unfavorable image, and which country characteristics are most appropriate to emphasize. The answer to this question may not always be self-evident. For example, a few years ago, German brewer Löwenbräu advertised as "tastefully engineered in Germany", which establishes a link with the well-known stereotype of solid German engineering. More recently however, Löwenbräu has adopted the slogan "Born in Münich, loved by the world", accompanied by pictures of rural scenery, green slopes and clean skies.

But consumers don't always have a favorable image of a country's products within a category. Moreover, consumers' images may (at relatively short notice) shift from positive to negative by factors that are often beyond the control of (individual) marketers, such as negative publicity around the origin country. Think for example about the negative impact of the "Mohammed cartoons" on the image and sales of Danish brands in the Arab world. Such events may transform country of origin from an asset to a liability.

Those who are marketing products or brands from a country of origin with an unfavorable product-country image are (therefore) often advised to conceal or at least de-emphasize the origin of the product (e.g., Roth – Romeo, 1992). This is not always a feasible practice, as trade regulations often require a clear and legible indication of the country of origin for a product. Moreover, consumers often associate brands with specific countries, so that country of origin is implicitly communicated through the brand name (note that this may be enhanced by past advertising with an emphasis on country of origin). Thus, when faced with negative product-country images, marketers might be forced to address these images directly, for example by means of advertising campaigns. This often involves long term, concerted actions of governmental organizations and companies (cf., Kotler – Jatusripitak – Maesincee, 1997). Such efforts should take into account that country of origin is not merely a shortcut that consumers use to form product evaluations. Verlegh et al. (2005) show that consumers use country of origin when they seek to determine the credibility of advertising claims, especially if ad involvement is high. In order to effectively improve consumers' product evaluations, marketers should adapt the (favorability of their) claims to the favorability of consumers' product-country images. Perhaps a more feasible alternative is to avoid a strong link with the country of origin. An interesting possibility in this light is the use of a "foreign branding" strategy, by choosing brand name and packaging that associate the product with a country that has a favorable image. A weakness of these strategies lies in the fact that many countries legally require companies to inform consumers of the country of origin of their products. Marketers might therefore choose to establish partnerships with companies from countries that enjoy a more favorable image, or to relocate (part of) their operations. Based on US legislation, Clarke, Owens and Ford (2000) show how companies might locate most of their production operations in (low-wage) foreign countries, while performing the final assembly in the USA, which enables them to use the favorable "made in the USA" label on their final product.

Be it positive or negative, country-of-origin effects are an important impact on consumer behavior, and marketers should be aware of the many different complex mechanisms that underlie this impact. This article has attempted to introduce and discuss some of these effects, and to link them to concrete advice for marketers.

References

Aaker, D. A. (1996): Building Strong Brands. New York: Free Press

Aaker, J. L. (1997): Dimensions of brand personality. Journal of Marketing Research, 34, 347-357.

Askegaard, S. – G. Ger (1998). Product-country images: toward a contextualized approach. European Advances in Consumer Research, 3, 50-58

Batra, R., V. – Ramaswamy, D.L. – Alden, J-B.E.M. – Steenkamp, – S. Ramachander (2000): Effects of brand local and nonlocal origin on consumer attitudes in developing countries. Journal of Consumer Psychology, 9, 83-95.

Billig, M. (1995): Banal Nationalism. London, UK: Sage

Brewer, M. B. (1979): In-group bias in the minimal intergroup situation: a cognitive-motivational analysis. Psychological Bulletin, 86, 307-24.

Brown, T. J., – Dacin, P. A. (1997): The company and the product: Corporate associations and consumer product responses. Journal of Marketing, 61(1), 68-84.

Clarke, I., M. Owens – J. B. Ford (2000): Integrating country of origin into global marketing strategy: A review of US marking statutes, International Marketing Review, 17,114-126

Dichter, E. (1962): The world customer. Harvard Business Review, 40 (4), 113-122.

Ellemers, N. – Wilke, H. – Van Knippenberg, A. (1993): Effects of the legitimacy of low group or individual status on individual and collective identity enhancement strategies. Journal of Personality and Social Psychology, 64, 766-778.

Engel, J. F. – R. D. Blackwell – P. W. Miniard (1995): Consumer Behavior, 8th ed., Forth Worth: Dryden Press

Ger, G. – S. Askegaard, – A. Christensen (1999): Experiential nature of product-place images: image as a narrative. Advances in Consumer Research, 26, 165-169.

Giddens, A. (1981): A Contemporary Critique of Historical Materialism. London: McMillan

Goldberg, M. E. – Hartwick, J. (1990): The effects of advertiser reputation and extremity of advertising claims on advertising effectiveness. Journal of Consumer Research, 17(2), 172-179.

Han, C. M. (1989): Country image: halo or summary construct? Journal of Marketing Research, 26(2), 222-229.

Häubl, G. – Elrod, T. (1999): The impact of congruity between brand name and country of production on consumers' product quality judgments. International Journal of Research in Marketing, 16(3), 199-215

Herche, J. (1992): A note on the predictive validity of the CETSCALE. Journal of the Academy of Marketing Science, 20, 261-264.

Heslop, L. A. – Papadopoulos, N. (1993): But who knows where and when: reflections on the images of countries and their products. In N. Papadopoulos – L. A. Heslop (Eds.), Product-Country Images: Impact and Role in International Marketing. New York: Haworth Press

Hewstone, M. – M. Rubin, – H. Willis (2002): Intergroup bias. Annual Review of Psychology, 53, 575-604.

Keller, K. L. (2003): Brand synthesis: The multidimensionality of brand knowledge. Journal of Consumer Research, 29(4), 595-600.

Keller, K. L. – Aaker, D. A. (1992): The effects of sequential introduction of brand extensions. Journal of Marketing Research, 29(1), 35-50.

Klein, J. G. (2002): Us versus them, or us versus everyone? Delineating consumer aversion to foreign goods. Journal of International Business Studies, 33, 345-364.

Klein, J. G. – R. Ettenson, – M. D. Morris (1998): The animosity model of foreign product purchase: an empirical test in the People's Republic of China. Journal of Marketing, 62, 89-100

Kotler, P. – S. Jatusripitak, – S. Maesincee (1997). The Marketing of Nations. New York: Free Press

Leclerc, F. – Schmitt, B. H. – Dubé, L. (1994): Foreign branding and its effects on product perceptions and attitudes. Journal of Marketing Research, 31(2), 263-270.

Levy, S. J. (1996): Stalking the amphisbaena. Journal of Consumer Research, 23, 163-176.

Li, W. K. – R. S. Wyer Jr. (1994): The role of country of origin in product evaluations: informational and standard-of-comparison effects. Journal of Consumer Psychology, 3, 187-212.

Mackie, D. M. – E. R. Smith (1998): Intergroup relations: insights from a theoretically integrative approach, Psychological Review, 105, 499-529.

Maheswaran, D. (1994): Country of origin as a stereotype: effects of consumer expertise and attribute strength on product evaluations. Journal of Consumer Research, 21(4), 354-365.

Netemeyer, R. G. – S. Durvasula – D. R. Lichtenstein (1991): A cross-national assessment of the reliability and validity of the CETSCALE, Journal of Marketing Research, 28, 320-327

Ohmae, K. (1989): The global logic of strategic alliances. Harvard Business Review, 67 (2) 143-154.

Okechuku, C. – V. Onyemah (1999): Nigerian consumer attitudes toward foreign and domestic products. Journal of International Business Studies, 30, 611-622.

Papadopoulos, N. – L. A. Heslop (1993): Product-Country Images: Impact and Role in International Marketing, New York: Haworth Press

Papadopoulos, N. – L. A Heslop – G. Bamossy (1990): A comparative image analysis of domestic versus imported products. International Journal of Research in Marketing, 7, 283-294.

Rossiter, J. R. – Percy, L. (1997): Advertising Communications and Promotion Management (2nd ed.) Oxford (UK): Blackwell

Roth, M. S. – Romeo, J. B. (1992): Matching product category and country image perceptions: a framework for managing country-of-origin effects. Journal of International Business Studies, 23(4), 477-497.

Shimp, T. A. – S. Sharma (1987): Consumer ethnocentrism: construction and validation of the CETSCALE. Journal of Marketing Research, 24, 280-89.

Tajfel, H. (1978): Social categorization, social identity and social comparison, in: H. Tajfel (ed.). Differentiation between Social Groups, London, UK: Academic Press

Turner, J. C. (1999): Some current issues in research on social identity and self-categorization theories, in: N. Ellemers et al. (eds.) Social Identity, p. 6-34. Oxford (UK): Blackwell

Usunier, J. C. (2006): Relevance in business research: The case of country-of-origin research in marketing. European Management Review, 3(1), 60-73.

Van Rekom, J. – G. Jacobs – P. W. J. Verlegh, – K. Podnar (forthcoming): Capturing the essence of a corporate brand personality: A Western brand in Eastern Europe. Journal of Brand Management, forthcoming

Verlegh, P. W. J. (forthcoming): Home country bias in product evaluation: the complementary roles of economic and socio-psychological motives, Journal of International Business Studies

Verlegh, P. W. J. – Steenkamp, J.-B. E. M. (1999): A review and meta-analysis of country-of-origin research. Journal of Economic Psychology, 20(5), 521-546.

Verlegh, P. W. J. – J-B. E. M. Steenkamp – M. T. G. Meulenberg (2005): Country-of-origin effects in consumer processing of advertising claims, International Journal of Research in Marketing, 22, 127-139.